

**Report on Study of University of Arizona Writing Program's
Support of International Students in English 107A, 107, or 108
May 10, 2014**

Executive Summary

During the 2013-14 academic year, a faculty research team studied the University of Arizona Writing Program's current structures and practices in teaching first-year composition courses for international students for whom English is as an additional or second language (L2). Through a syllabus review, teacher and student surveys, program numerical data analysis, review of current L2 writing scholarship, and analysis of peer institutions, the study examined the following questions:

1. What are the Writing Program's current practices for supporting international second language (L2) writers?
2. What is the program doing well?
3. What could the program be doing better?
4. What are the challenges and obstacles the program faces in offering the best possible support to international L2 writers?

The research report addresses these questions in four major areas: institutional context, Writing Program curriculum, placement practices, and teacher preparation and support. Based on our research, we identify the following recommendations for continued improvement in the support of international L2 writers.

Writing Program Curriculum

1. Continue to offer L2 writing courses as options for our L2 writers.
2. Adjust the course cap for all L2 writing courses to 15, in line with national recommendations.
3. Explore the feasibility of offering a pre-107 course (or set of courses) for L2 writers.
4. Explore the feasibility of creating additional first-year course structures for L2 writers, including stretch courses or paired language sections or studios.
5. Explore options for the combination courses, including discontinuing them or designing versions that aim to build on the diverse classroom population as a resource for learning.
6. Develop a linguistically appropriate and culturally relevant curriculum for L2 writing courses, which meets the shared Writing Program Student Learning Outcomes.

Placement Practices

7. Continue to assess and update current placement practices.
8. Research the suitability of using students' TOEFL (composite and/or writing subscore) or IELTS scores in lieu of UA writing placement scores.
9. Establish a clear line of administrative support and oversight of L2 writing placement.

Teacher Preparation and Support

10. Explore options for on-going teacher support.
11. Develop and maintain a pool of easily accessible resources for L2 writing instructors.

General Recommendations

12. Foster a Writing Program culture in which L2 writing concerns are integrated throughout all program elements.
13. Examine effective administrative structures for L2 writing support at peer institutions and consider possible changes that can ensure on-going and sustainable oversight and development of L2 writing interests.
14. Explore L2 writing support needs at UA outside of the first-year L2 writing context.

**Report on Study of University of Arizona Writing Program's
Support of International Students in English 107A, 107, or 108
May 10, 2014**

1.0 Background and Aims

A research team convened in August 2013 with the aim of studying the Writing Program's current support of international undergraduate students in first-year composition courses. Since at least 1992, the Writing Program (WP) has offered English 107 and 108, courses parallel to English 101 and 102, but designed specifically for international students for whom English is an additional or second language. Some sections of 101/107 and some sections of 102/108 are combined and conducted as a single course taught by a single instructor. At least as early as 1993, the Writing Program offered English 106, a parallel section of English 100, for international students who were identified as needing developmental coursework before 107/101; English 100 and 106 were discontinued in 2009. In Fall 2009, the Writing Program began offering English 107A (initially titled "English 107+"), parallel to English 101A and designed for writers who may need additional support in the first-semester course. All three courses for second language (L2) writers (107A, 107, and 108) are taught by faculty, GATs, or adjuncts who have had training and experience in teaching L2 learners.

Because this study aimed to build a wide-angle view of the Writing Program's current support for first-year international second language writers, the scope of our research was broad, guided by the following questions:

1. What are the Writing Program's current practices for supporting international second language (L2) writers?
2. What is the program doing well?
3. What could the program be doing better?
4. What are the challenges and obstacles the program faces in offering the best possible support to international L2 writers?

This report summarizes the research in these areas and outlines several recommendations for continued improvement in the support of international L2 writers.

Although this report focuses specifically on international student L2 writers in first-year composition courses, we are aware that there are many domestic students in English 101A, 101, and 102 who are also writing in their second language and who often exhibit a wide variety of proficiencies in written English, oral English, and cultural acclimation.

2.0 Data sources

We collected the following sources of data throughout AY 2013-14:

- 107A/107/108 course syllabi
- Discussions with International Admissions, the International Student Office, and the Think Tank/Writing Center
- Numerical program data (enrollment, placement, sections, TOEFL, course grades)
- Placement research report from Fall 2013
- Survey of Fall 2013 107a/107/108 instructors (n=15)

- Survey of Fall 2013 107a/107/108 students (n=132)
- Relevant scholarship on writing programs and L2 writer support
- Analysis of similar peer program structures and teacher development (including ABOR peer institutions and non-ABOR-peer programs with similar programs and resources, including MA in TESOL, PhD in applied linguistics, PhD in rhetoric and composition, and adjunct faculty)

3.0 Institutional Context

3.1 Student Demographics and Admissions

In the Fall of 2013, University of Arizona enrolled 3,118 international students, 1,632 of whom were undergraduates. That same semester, 431 international students enrolled in 25 sections of English 107, 107A, 101/107, 108, or 102/108 (also referred to here as “L2 courses”), making up 7.6% of the total WP student population that semester.

By the end of the Fall semester, there were 366 international students enrolled in English 107A or 107. As Table 1 illustrates, the strong majority of enrolled students (78%) were from China, roughly reflecting the demographics of the UA international student population. The WP’s L2 writing classes, therefore, consist primarily of students using one of three language groups: a Chinese language (usually Mandarin) (n=287), Arabic (n=42), and Spanish (n=9).

Table 1: Country of origin for students enrolled in English 107A and 107, Fall 2013, compared with institutional and national distributions

Country	Students enrolled in 107A or 107, Fall 2013		UA Undergraduate and Graduate Population 2012 ⁱ		U.S. Undergraduate International Student Enrollment ⁱⁱ	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
China	285	78%	1,385	44.4%	93,789	28%
Saudi Arabia	23	6%	106	3.4%	20,667	6%
Kuwait	16	4%	60	1.9%	3,094	1%
South Korea	15	4%	172	5.5%	38,094	11%
Mexico	7	2%	143	4.6%	7,956	2%
Taiwan	3	0.8%	80	2.6%	5,999	2%
Vietnam	3	0.8%	24	0.8%	11,382	3%
Japan	2	0.5%	47	1.5%	9,126	3%
Malaysia	2	0.5%	21	0.7%	4,686	1%
Qatar	2	0.5%	4	0.1%	819	0.2%
Other (1 student each from: Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Nigeria, Peru, Sweden, UAE)	9	2.5%	1,076	34.5%	144,381	43%
Total	366	100%	3,118	100%	339,993	100%

ⁱThe second largest country of origin among UA international students is India, with 286 students (9.2%).

ⁱⁱFrom Institute of International Education Open Doors Data: <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Enrollment-Trends>

University of Arizona’s current efforts to recruit more international students from Canada and Europe could influence the overall demographic profile of UA international students but may not necessarily impact the demographics in the WP’s L2 writing courses.

Beginning in Fall 2013, UA raised the minimum TOEFL iBT composite score from 61 to 70 (out of a possible 120); some individual programs have higher requirements. According to the Admissions Office, the average TOEFL iBT score for admitted students is 80; in Fall 2013, the average score for international students enrolled in 107A or 107 was 78. The University is considering raising the requirement to 79 over the next few years and/or moving to a system that requires minimum sub-scores (in the four test areas of listening, reading, speaking, and writing). The Admissions Office is also tracking international students' TOEFL scores, GPAs, and retention rates during AY 2013-14.

3.1.1 Challenges: UA's relatively low admission requirements for English language proficiency pose a substantial challenge to L2 writers and their instructors in the Writing Program. Many ABOR peer institutions require a minimum score of 15 on each individual TOEFL section (a practice recommended by ETS), but this is currently not a practice at UA. In comments provided in our instructor survey, 1/3 of the 15 teachers noted students' linguistic and cultural preparation to be an area of concern. Some teachers also feel it is difficult to effectively teach the range of levels within a given section.

3.2 University Support for International Students

International Student Services offers general support for international students, including International Student Orientation. Additional campus-wide resources include an orientation program offered by the Association of Chinese Students and Scholars, which focused on academic integrity and campus resources, and workshops and social events offered by the Office of Global Initiatives, though these are reportedly not usually well attended. The Think Tank Writing Center also offers writing support to international students.

4.0 Writing Program Curriculum

4.1 Course Offerings and Structures

The Writing Program currently offers three courses (107A, 107A, 108) designed exclusively for international L2 writers, as well as offering two "combined courses" (101/107 and 102/108). Course offerings and enrollment caps are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Enrollment Caps and Course Offerings in Writing Program L2 Writing Courses

Course	Equivalent to	Enrollment cap	# of sections in Fall 2013	# of sections in Spring 2014
English 107A	English 101A	22	3	3
English 107	English 101	23	12	4
English 108	English 102	23	4	17
English 101/107	English 101	25	4	2
English 102/108	English 102	25	2	2

4.1.1 Strengths: In total, 92% of student survey respondents said that they would prefer to take 107A/107/108 over 101A/101/102. Students indicated an appreciation for many aspects of the courses, noting that these courses build their confidence in English, are a good way for international students to learn the basics of writing, and are easier to understand than other courses.

4.1.2 Areas for improvement: The lack of any developmental writing or language courses for matriculated international students poses a significant challenge to many L2 writing students and instructors. In fall 2013, more than 60% of 107A/107 students had a TOEFL iBT score below 80, the minimum admission requirement at our ABOR peer institutions.

One-third of the 107A/107 students (n=108) scored below 75. There is a clear need for language and developmental writing support for our undergraduate international students, yet we currently have no such options available.

As a comparison, many of our ABOR peers offer developmental L2 writing courses, despite having TOEFL minimums of at least 79. UC Davis, for example, requires a TOEFL minimum of 80 and also offers a sequence of four developmental writing courses for L2 writers; their WP administrators are advocating to raise the TOEFL minimum to 100 because so many of their admitted L2 students struggle.

While standardized test scores cannot provide a complete picture of students' language profiles, they can indicate general levels of language skills. Because many of our students' sub-scores indicate "limited" proficiency levels (as described by TOEFL's descriptors), they will likely need additional support in order to succeed in their courses, including their writing courses. *Given the complexities involved in L2 and L2 writing development (already well documented in research), it is unrealistic to expect many of our students to meet the writing goals of English 107A or 107 within a single semester-long course.*

Course enrollment caps pose an additional challenge and important area for improvement, and this was a concern noted in the teacher survey. The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Statement on Second Language Writers and Writing recommends an enrollment cap of no more than 18 for writing courses made up of large numbers of L2 writers and no more than 15 for courses made up exclusively of L2 writers. Smaller enrollment numbers are necessary for teachers to provide the additional time and support needed for students working in their second language. At the current class sizes of 23, we are more than 50% over the recommended cap.

4.2 Combined Sections

The WP offers a very small number of courses each semester that combine a 101 and 107 section or a 102 and 108 section (with 11-14 students enrolled in each section, and 25 total students in the course), referred to as *combined courses*. The origins of these courses, and the original goals involved, are unclear. Currently, students typically do not know that they are enrolled in a combined course until they arrive to class.

4.2.1 Strengths: Writing courses that intentionally integrate L1 and L2 users have been recommended by L2 writing scholars as one option available in writing programs because of their potential for engaging students in valuable dialogue about language, culture, and learning. Some instructors at UA have expressed interest in the theoretical advantages of combined sections, and some are largely successful in attaining the necessary environment for collaboration and exchange. The students who enjoy these courses report that they like the cultural interactions, although the negative student comments are more numerous. Combined courses also have the potential learning benefits of giving interested students the opportunity for cross-cultural and cross-linguistic interaction and exchange.

4.2.2 Areas for improvement: The combined courses, as currently administered and taught, face several challenges:

- The original goals of the course are currently unclear and are not articulated in any program documents.
- Little to no additional support is offered to course instructors, and few teachers request or are prepared to teach combined courses.

- The courses pose an administrative challenge.
- Students currently do not know that they have registered for a combined section until they attend the first class.
- The monolingual and multilingual students often bring very distinct backgrounds in English, writing, and educational culture to the class. As a result, teachers report finding it difficult to effectively manage classroom interactions and to meet all students' needs and interests.

The goals and focus of the combined courses could be re-envisioned and developed to intentionally encourage the kind of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic interaction and exchange, engaging students in issues of language, culture, and global communication. An alternative route is to discontinue offering combined sections until a course could be designed that is suitable to student levels and interests.

4.3 Course Content

Through a review of course syllabi and teacher and student survey data, we examined the 107a/107/108 course content and alignment with 101a/101/102. In general, we conclude that:

- The L2 courses generally teach the same genres and writing skills as the 101A/101/102 courses.
- Teachers of the L2 courses report that while attempting to address the same genres and writing skills, there are differences in the student population that require teachers to make modifications to help students succeed in the courses:
 - International students have different rhetorical and linguistic concerns than domestic L1 English or L2 writers;
 - Addressing the individual needs of L2 writers often requires more one-on-one time between teachers and students.
 - International students are often unfamiliar with many aspects of U.S. academic culture and classroom practices.
- Grammatical language skills are addressed in the L2 courses, individually and with the entire class, but generally do not appear on the syllabus and are not specifically articulated as course goals.
- L2 course instructors report often using shorter reading texts, different classroom activities, and modified assignments that are more culturally accessible to international students.
- Many teachers report that the pace of their L2 courses needs to be slowed in comparison with 101A/101/102.

Students from 107A/107/108 who responded to our survey report learning in several areas, most commonly: organization and structure (n=21), analysis, including organizational structure of analysis (n=23), citations and MLA format (n=26), grammar or mechanics (n=13). Additional areas of learning noted by multiple students include: research skills, effective essay writing, critical reading and critical thinking, writing in the Western World/US, and avoiding plagiarism.

4.3.1 Strengths: The 107A/107/108 courses, as parallel courses to 101A/101/102, have goals that are relevant and necessary for international students, and students report learning important skills in these courses.

4.3.2 Areas for improvement: While all courses that fulfill the first-year composition sequence must meet the same student learning outcomes, the language support involved in

the L2 writing courses also necessitates some distinct course goals and content. Currently, such goals or curricular distinctions are not articulated, potentially leaving an impression of the L2 course as being “identical” rather than “parallel” to the 101A/101/102 courses. Articulation of course goals and content for L2 courses could also provide important guides for both teachers and students.

4.4 Textbook Usage

Because materials form a substantial part of a curriculum, we examined textbook usage in the L2 courses, both through a review of course syllabi and through the instructor survey. The survey asked course instructors to rate and comment on the extent of their usage of the program-wide textbooks. Table 3 reports just the *majority* responses by book and course.

Table 3: Teacher Reported Usage of Program Textbooks by Course (Majority Responses Indicated)

	107A (n=3)	107 (n=13)	107/101 (n=4)	108 (n=10)	108/102 (n=7)
<i>Rules for Writers</i>	Variable	“somewhat” (54%)	“somewhat” (50%)	“somewhat” (50%)	“somewhat” (57%)
<i>Writing as Revision</i>	Variable	“not at all” (46%)	“not at all” (75%)	N/A	N/A
<i>Student’s Guide to First-Year Writing</i>	“a great deal” (67%)	“a great deal” (46%) “somewhat” (46%)	“a great deal” (75%)	“a great deal” (70%)	“a great deal” (57%)
<i>Writing Public Lives</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	“a great deal” (40%) “somewhat” (40%)	“a great deal” (43%) “somewhat” (43%)

In sum, instructors report using *A Student’s Guide to First-Year Writing* and *Writing Public Lives* fairly extensively but *Writing as Revision* much less. Some common reasons provided for not using program textbooks consistently included:

- a desire to deter plagiarism by using less common readings
- a preference for shorter readings
- a preference for fewer readings (in order to spend time on other aspects of language development or cultural awareness).

Less common reasons included the following: a preference for texts more relevant to the students’ interests and experiences, a focus on writing rather than reading, an approach of teaching grammar through student writing (rather than *RFW*), and the adoption of a theme-based course. Instructors who adopted alternative resources reported using shorter texts, international texts, theme-based texts, and students’ own work.

Teachers of 107A and 107 have been encouraged recently to choose books other than *Writing as Revision* because of the cultural inaccessibility of much of the content as well as the prevalence of plagiarism in classrooms that use the book.

Rules for Writers was updated this academic year, with sections written with L2 writers in mind and with some sections written by L2 writers.

4.4.1 Areas for improvement: Given the teachers’ indication that *Writing as Revision* is not highly utilized in the L2 courses, alternative textbook and reading recommendations could

be explored and made available to instructors. Anthologies with contemporary readings that are culturally relevant would be particularly useful for teachers.

Concerns about plagiarism have been linked to *Writing as Revision* by some. Textual borrowing practices have been extensively studied in L2 writing scholarship, and are generally found to be most likely to occur when students are faced with tasks and texts that are unmanageable; therefore, providing students with appropriate texts and scaffolding is vital to supporting their learning.

The *Students' Guide* has mixed responses from both instructors and students. Although the majority of instructors surveyed rated the *SG* as “effective” or “occasionally effective,” several commented that their students could not complete assigned readings or noted that the *SG* materials needed to be written in a more accessible way. Just over half of students surveyed also responded that the *SG* was “very useful” or “somewhat useful,” with the remainder responding that it was “not very useful” or that they had not used it.

5.0 Placement Practices

A full study of placement procedures was carried out by D.R. Ransdell in Fall 2013, so we provide only a brief summary of practices here.

Currently, the majority of international students take a one-hour in-house essay exam during orientation¹, usually very shortly before classes begin or right after they start; often, they have been in the U.S. for just a few days or weeks. These essays are scored by placement exam raters from the Writing Program, and the students are assigned to 107A, 101A, 107, or 101. Students may request a different course assignment if desired; course assignment changes are contingent on the type of move desired, the placement exam score, and course availability. Table 4 illustrates international student placement in Fall 2013 courses *by in-house placement exam*, demonstrating that a high majority of students taking the exam were placed into English 107.

Table 4: Distribution of Exam Placement Decisions, Fall 2013

	Fall 2013 Exam (n=296)	Fall 2013 Make-up Exam (n=19)	Total (n=315)
English 101	19 (6%)	2 (11%)	21 (7%)
English 107A	27 (9%)	1 (5%)	28 (9%)
English 107	250 (85%)	16 (84%)	266 (84%)

A descriptive comparison of students' TOEFL scores by course placement (see Table 5) demonstrates that the 107A students, in general, have slightly lower composite and writing sub-scores than the 107 students; a statistical analysis could determine whether these differences are significant. Table 5 further indicates that students in both courses have a wide range of scores in all sections, from 2 to the maximum of 30, and that in some cases composite scores may mask low subscores.

¹ International students who have a diploma from a US high school may be placed by their GPA and test scores.

Table 5: Average TOEFL Scores by 107A/107 Class (Fall 2013)

	ENGL 107A (n=54)			ENGL 107 (n=254)			n=308
	Lowest score	Highest score	Mean score	Lowest score	Highest score	Mean score	Overall Mean
Composite	42	98	76.0	50	102	78.3	77.9
Writing	10	22	15.9	10	27	19.1	18.6
Listening	2	30	21.3	7	30	20.3	20.5
Reading	8	30	21.8	5	30	21.1	21.2
Speaking	8	27	16.7	9	30	18.0	17.8

Note: The maximum composite score is 120; maximum scores for each subsection are 30. TOEFL describes three score levels for the writing subscore: 1-16=Limited; 17-23=Fair; 24-30=Good.

Based on findings from the Fall 2013 placement study, some revisions were made to the Spring 2014 placement scoring for international students, including development of a more complete rubric and clear placement guidelines, and a set of ten anchors for training placement advisors.

5.1 Strengths

Revisions to the placement exam rubric, guidelines, and rater training in Spring 2014 are an important positive step.

5.2 Areas for improvement

We have identified several areas for improvement regarding placement of international L2 writers into first-year composition courses:

- *A large number of L2 writing instructors report feeling that many of their students are struggling.* Teachers' comments tended to center on both language skills and familiarity with US academic practices rather than on writing per se. For instance, they cite concerns with general language skills, grammar, and oral/aural English, all of which lead to challenges in understanding instructions and assignments, participating in collaborative peer activities, and completing readings. A lack of familiarity with US academic culture was also consistently cited, and it was noted that students' new adjustment to US classrooms may affect their willingness to ask questions, participate in class discussion, seek support from their instructor or the Writing Center, as well as understanding assigned readings and discourse conventions.
- *The range of student language and writing skills within a single section is often extremely broad,* making it difficult to adequately support all students in a section. This range of variation could be a result of ineffective placement procedures, lack of developmental (pre-English 107) course offerings, or a combination of these issues.
- *The current placement exam has not been adequately developed, assessed, or revised.* The current exam includes a reading passage that may pose both linguistic and cultural barriers to students. We were unable to learn more about the history of this exam and how it was designed, but we have found no evidence that it was piloted, assessed, or revised. Given instructor feedback about student placement, however, it seems that a more effective exam (or other placement tool) is needed. Our ABOR peer institutions adopt the following placement methods for writing courses:
 - ACT or SAT scores (including writing component)
 - Internal writing placement exam

- TOEFL (including composite and individual section scores)
 - Combination of high school records and standardized test scores
- *Students are currently placed into courses rather than presented with options for registration. While they may request a change in their placement, in practice, doing so often difficult. L2 writing scholarship has long recommended that L2 writers be given multiple appropriate options that can suit a range of needs and interests (including, for example, courses like 107A, 101A, 107, 101, and combined 101/107) and that students be guided in selecting from those options.²*

5.3 Obstacles

Before addressing these areas of concern, it is important to note two existing obstacles to better placement practices: (1) a lack of developmental writing courses for L2 students (that is, limited options available to suit the range of student needs), (2) a lack of compensated administrative oversight of the current placement exam, including development, ongoing assessment of its effectiveness (including issues of validity and reliability), and selection and training of raters.

6.0 Teacher Preparation and Support

Currently, WP instructors are eligible to teach L2 courses if they are 2nd year ELL or SLAT students or if they complete a 9-hour, 3-part workshop offered by the Writing Program the previous semester. For AY 1203-14, our teacher pool met the following eligibility requirements:

Table 6: Spring Workshop Completion among AY 2013-14 L2 Writing Course Instructors.

	Completed spring workshop	Did not complete spring workshop	Total
2 nd year ELL	3	1	4
2 nd + year SLAT	2	6	8
2 nd + year other ENGL program	4	0	4
Adjunct	1	3	4
Total	10	10	20

Additionally, our teacher survey indicates that the majority of our teachers have experience and academic preparation for teaching L2 learners, with 80% having had prior ESL/EFL teaching experience and 73% having had some graduate coursework in L2 teaching or second language acquisition; 60% have or are completing an MA in TESOL/applied linguistics.

Currently, L2 writing teachers receive ongoing support from the 107A/107/108 Course Director, who works with them on strategies for addressing language/grammar, developing curriculum, addressing classroom issues, and dealing with plagiarism. Teachers may differ in their knowledge of and comfort levels for addressing these issues with students. The Course Director also reviews and provides feedback and guidance on the first set of papers that teachers grade for an L2 section.

² See the CCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers, <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting> and Silva (1997). On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 359-363.

6.1 Strengths

When asked in the survey whether they felt sufficiently prepared to teach 107A/107/108, 8 out of 15 instructors (53%) said yes. Reasons provided were their previous experience (n=3) and academic background (n=2).

6.2 Areas for improvement

Several areas for improvement were identified:

- *Many teachers feel underprepared.* Seven of the 15 respondents (47%) said that they did not feel sufficiently prepared and provided the following reasons (n=6):
 - Little orientation
 - Not prepared for the wide range of levels
 - Not prepared for working with very low-level students
 - Not prepared to address grammar and language issues
 - Previous coursework has not emphasized practical pedagogical methods
 - Comfortable with ESL concerns but not L2 writing
 - Would like more training on teaching combined classes

All 15 survey participants provided responses regarding additional support or resources that they would find helpful. The most common suggestion included continued workshops or other forums for ongoing support (n=4) and formation of peer groups with other teachers or faculty (n=2). Other requests included smaller class sizes, a more extensive pre-semester workshop, tutoring experience the semester before teaching, course director support, relevant coursework (e.g., ENGL 5960: Second Language Writing), support for grammar instruction, and better admissions and placement practices. Finally, we note that when additional meetings for L2 writing instructors were required in the past, some teachers felt that they were overburdened by the time commitments.

- *Instructor survey respondents also identified a need for more support resources*, such as appropriate reading texts, culturally and linguistically accessible classroom materials (including for practical skills such as quoting), and ideas for tailoring assignments for combo sections. Some voiced a desire to collaborate more closely with Think Tank and CESL, and to receive information about students' TOEFL scores.
- *There is a high burden placed on the Course Director.* The 107a/107/108 Course Director receives a small stipend but no course release for this work, which restricts the amount of time that can be devoted to teacher development.

Other universities offer some potential models for teacher development and support. Some universities with specialists in L2 writing, for example, require a credit-bearing practicum course in which GATs enroll during their first semester teaching an L2 writing course; others require regular participation in a learning collaborative or mentoring group. Arizona State University also requires that L2 writing instructors complete a graduate course on Second Language Writing before teaching or during their first semester teaching L2 writing. We have the faculty and curricular resources to implement such requirements, but GATs may be unable to take elective coursework due to other program requirements or scheduling conflicts.

7.0 Recommendations and Future Directions

7.1 Writing Program Curriculum

- 7.1.1 *Continue to offer L2 writing courses as options for our L2 writers.* Our survey responses from both teachers and students indicate broad support for these courses and identify them to play an important role in our students' success.
- 7.1.2 *Adjust the course cap for all L2 writing courses to 15,* bringing the courses in line with the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) recommendations and allowing teachers the time to provide the necessary support to the students
- 7.1.3 *Explore the feasibility of offering a pre-107 course (or set of courses) for L2 writers,* particularly if the university's TOEFL score minimums (including subscore minimums) are not raised. Such developmental courses might include an emphasis on listening, speaking, and reading, as well as writing.
- 7.1.4 *Explore the feasibility of creating additional first-year course structures for L2 writers,* including stretch courses or paired language sections or studios.
- 7.1.5 *Explore options for the combination courses,* including discontinuing them or designing versions that aim to build on the diverse classroom population as a resource for learning.
- 7.1.6 *Develop a linguistically appropriate and culturally relevant curriculum for L2 writing courses,* which meets the shared Writing Program Student Learning Outcomes. Such curricular modifications may be related to the number and type of writing assignments, the length and type of readings, and the relative focus on language. Articulate any course goals unique to the L2 writing courses.

7.2 Placement Practices

- 7.2.1 *Continue to assess and update current placement practices,* with possible revisions including:
- A revised sit-down writing exam
 - Regular and consistent rater training and norming
 - Creation of an algorithm for writing course placement that takes into account English proficiency test scores (e.g., TOEFL or IELTS), writing placement exam score, and possibly prior experience with English and English-medium.
 - Presenting students with course options within their assigned placement.
- 7.2.2 *Research the suitability of using students' TOEFL (composite and writing subscore) or IELTS scores in lieu of UA writing placement scores.*
- 7.2.3 *Establish a clear line of administrative support and oversight of L2 writing placement.*

7.3 Teacher Preparation and Support

- 7.3.1 *Explore options for on-going teacher support, including an L2 writing teacher collaborative (similar to the 101A teacher collaborative) and/or a workshop or brown bag series.*
- 7.3.2 *Develop and maintain a pool of easily accessible resources for L2 writing instructors, drawing on current instructors' successful practices and materials.*

7.4 General Recommendations

- 7.4.1 *Foster a Writing Program culture in which L2 writing concerns are integrated throughout all program elements, including the following: student learning outcomes, curriculum development and revision, textbook editing and selection, assessment, research, and teacher development.*
- 7.4.2 *Examine administrative structures for L2 writing support at peer institutions and consider possible structural revisions to the WP that can ensure on-going and sustainable oversight and development of L2 writing interests. Many of the recommendations described in this report require substantial time and expertise to address. An administrative structure that supports and compensates this work should be established.*
- 7.4.3 *Explore L2 writing support needs at UA outside of the first-year L2 writing sections, including L2 writers in other first-year writing courses, writing in the disciplines, and graduate student L2 writers.*